

REMARKS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bakshi et al. (US 6,772,200) in view of Petty et al. (US 6, 342,907).

For a §103 obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. MPEP 2143.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a method of parsing content received by at least one client coupled to a server, the method comprising “receiving, by at least one client, a parser from a server; reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client; and parsing the received content by said at least one client.”

Bakshi fails to disclose reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in the at least one client, as recited in Claim 1. On Page 3 of the Office Action dated August 24, 2005, Examiner even admits that “Bakshi is silent regarding: reconstructing said parser in a web browser operating in said at least one client.” However, Examiner asserts that Petty discloses a content parsing system parsing content for display at the client device, including reconstructing (i.e., rendering) the parser in a web browser operating in the at least one client. Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Petty into the system of Bakshi to generate the received content in a proper format for display to the user. Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's assertions.

As previously discussed in Applicant's Response to Office Action dated June 9, 2005, Petty does not disclose reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in at least one client, as recited in Claim 1. Petty, as cited by Examiner, merely discloses "when a user links to a web page that incorporates a Java applet developed using the PDML framework, the archived class library is downloaded to the web client, and all parsing and rendering is performed in the browser's execution space." (Col. 10, lines 20-26). If Examiner is asserting that "the archived class library" is a parser, Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner provide evidence, or else withdraw the rejection.

Applicant previously made such a request in the above-mentioned Response to Office Action. However, no evidence has been provided. Furthermore, Examiner has not provided a response to Applicant's previous arguments that Petty does not disclose reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in at least one client. Applicant respectfully requests that Examiner point out why Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, or else withdraw the rejection.

Additionally, Examiner asserts that Petty's "rendering" constitutes reconstructing. As would be appreciated by one ordinarily skilled in the art, the mere mention of rendering does not teach or otherwise suggest reconstructing a parser. Applicant cannot find, nor has Examiner cited, any evidence of this rendering in Petty constituting the step of reconstructing a parser.

Since neither Bakshi nor Petty individually discloses reconstructing a parser in a web browser operating in at least one client, they cannot disclose this limitation in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has failed to establish that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art.

Additionally, even if Petty did teach reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in a client, there is no suggestion or incentive that would motivate one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Bakshi to include this element. Examiner asserts that the motivation would be to generate the received content in a proper format for display to a user. However, Applicant cannot find, nor has Examiner cited, any mention in the prior art of Bakshi suffering from not being able to generate received content in a proper format for display to a user.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no suggestion or incentive that would motivate one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Bakshi to include the step of reconstructing the parser in a web browser operating in the client.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over Bakshi in view of Petty. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-13

Since Claims 2-13 depend from Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-13 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-13 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 14

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 14 as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 14 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-23

Since Claims 15-23 depend from Claim 14, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15-23 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15-23 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 24

The same arguments made above with respect to the patentability of Claim 1 are applicable to the patentability of Claim 24 as well. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 24 is currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-33


Since Claims 25-33 depend from Claim 24, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25-33 are also patentable as they contain the same limitations as Claim 24. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25-33 are currently in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this application, the Examiner may telephone the undersigned at 775-586-9500.

Respectfully submitted,
SIERRA PATENT GROUP, LTD.

Dated: November 22, 2005

Sierra Patent Group, Ltd.
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449
(775) 586-9500
(775) 586-9550 Fax


Jonathan D. Hanish
Reg. No. 57,821